

REMARKS

Claims 23-31 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In a Final Official Action dated March 24, 2005, claims 23-25 and 27-30 were rejected and claims 26 and 31 were objected to.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Dependent claims 26 and 31 were objected to for being dependent upon rejected base claims, but have been indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claims 26 and 31 have been amended as the Examiner suggested. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted claims 26 and 31 now are patentable to Applicants.

The Examiner rejected claims 23-24, 27, and 29-30 under 35 USC §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Apte. This rejection is now traversed.

Claims 23 and 29 respectively describe a method and computer program product for tracking historical data from different sources, comprising, *inter alia*, “automatically determining dimensions of the stored data having historically significant attributes; and in response to a change to a dimension having a historically significant attribute, creating a historical record of the change.” These aspects of the claimed invention provide the ability to partition historical data into records before and after a change has been made.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by Apte. Apte describes extracting data from disparate sources, and converting and formatting the data before storage (see, e.g., col. 3, ll. 12-15, as cited by the Examiner). However, nowhere does

Apte disclose or suggest at least “determining dimensions of the stored data having historically significant attributes” or “creating a historical record of the change” as claimed. In a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every claim element must be present in the reference. However, as the Examiner has failed to point out these claimed elements, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Similarly, claim 30 describes a system for tracking historical data from different sources as described above, comprising, *inter alia*, a source adapter and an analytic data interface. As discussed above, Apte does not disclose or suggest at least “determining dimensions of the stored data having historically significant attributes” or “creating a historical record of the change,” nor does Apte discuss a system including a source adapter or an analytic data interface for these purposes.

Thus, for at least these reasons claims 23, 29, and 30 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Claims 24-25 and 27-28 depend from their respective base claims, which were shown above to be patentable over Apte. In addition, these claims recite additional limitations that also are not disclosed by Apte, variously including configuring unique key identification information, performing source-related clean up, overwriting the dimension, or maintaining the stored dimension having a historically significant attribute in a first record and storing the change to the dimension having a historically significant attribute in a second record. Thus, dependent claims 24-25 and 27-also are patentably distinct over Apte for at least this additional reason, and are now in condition for allowance.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 28 as being unpatentable over Apte in view of Carothers. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 28 depends from claim 23, which is shown above to be patentable over Apte. In addition, claim 28 describes “processing source-specific data originating at sources with disparate formats into source-independent data with a single, common format” by “configuring unique key identification information.” This aspect of the claimed invention provides unique identification information to avoid problems arising from the fact that the number of keys differ in each source.

This aspect of the claimed invention is not disclosed or suggested by Carothers. Carothers describes comparing stored data and data to be loaded to determine whether the status of network nodes has changed (see, e.g., Abstract, as cited by the Examiner). However, nowhere does Carothers describe processing source-specific data originating at sources with disparate formats into source-independent data with a single, common format by configuring unique key identification information as claimed by Applicants. Thus, claim 28 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least this additional reason.

In sum, claims 23-31, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Firoz Kanchwalla, David Lyle, Sujit Bais,
Srinivasan Maadapusi, Amol Dongre, and
Premkumar Somakumar

Date: April 20, 2005

By: 

Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784

FENWICK & WEST LLP

801 California Street

Mountain View, CA 94041

Phone: (650) 335-7213

Fax: (650) 938-5200

23402/09411/DOCS/1518414.1